

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION

ORDER

Pending before the Court is a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of the Magistrate Judge (Doc. No. 86), recommending that the Court grant Defendants’ motion for summary judgment (Doc. No. 72, “Motion”) and dismiss this action.¹ No objections to the R&R have been filed, and the time for filing objections has now expired.²

The failure to object to a report and recommendation releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. *Frias v. Frias*, No. 2:18-cv-00076, 2019 WL 549506, at *2 (M.D. Tenn. Feb. 12, 2019); *Hart v. Bee Property Mgmt.*, No. 18-cv-11851, 2019 WL 1242372, at * 1

¹ As the R&R properly notes, Plaintiff did not file a response to the Motion, nor did he file any request for an extension of time within which to do so. However, on September 11, 2023, Plaintiff filed a packet of documents at Doc. No. 85 reproducing documents that had been previously filed by Defendants, including: the Motion, a memorandum filed in support of the Motion (Doc. No. 73), a statement of undisputed material facts (Doc. No. 74), a motion to seal (Doc. No. 75), a declaration of Raymond Byrd (Doc. No. 76), and a declaration of Elizabeth Lopez (Doc. No. 78). Scribbled across nearly every page of this packet of documents (presumably by Plaintiff) was some variation of “Void for Fraud” or “Void.” Whatever Plaintiff’s intent by this filing, the Court will not interpret it as a response objecting to the Motion.

² Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), any party has fourteen (14) days from receipt of the R&R in which to file any written objections to the Recommendation with the District Court. For pro-se plaintiffs, like Plaintiff, the Court is willing to extend this 14-day deadline by three days to allow time for filings to be transported by mail.

(E.D. Mich. March 18, 2019) (citing *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985)). The district court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made. *Ashraf v. Adventist Health System/Sunbelt, Inc.*, 322 F. Supp. 3d 879, 881 (W.D. Tenn. 2018); *Benson v. Walden Security*, No. 3:18-cv-0010, 2018 WL 6322332, at *3 (M.D. Tenn. Dec. 4, 2018). The district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and rulings to which no specific objection is filed. *Id.*

Nonetheless, the Court has reviewed the R&R and the file. The R&R is adopted and approved. Accordingly, Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment at Doc. No. 72 is GRANTED. Plaintiff's claims are hereby DISMISSED, and the Clerk is directed to enter judgment under Rule 58 and close the file.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Eli Richardson
ELI RICHARDSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE